

|   |                        |                     |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |
|   | 10/026,736             | SZARKA ET AL.       |
|   | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |
|   | Daniel P Stephenson    | 3672                |

**All Participants:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(1) Daniel P Stephenson. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Loren G. Helmreich. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 6 May 2004 **Time:** 2:00

**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant  Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes  No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

24,36 and 41-45

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was related to the applicant that the case was in condition for allowance except for some informalities that needed to be corrected. Specifically, claim 24 was still dependent from cancelled claim 17, claim 36 was dependent from cancelled claim 34, and new claims 41-45 were directed to a previously non-elected invention and needed to be cancelled. The examiner offered to do an examiners amendment to correct the claims and the applicant agreed to the changes. Specifically, claim 24 was changed to depend from claim 2, claim 36 was made independent, and claims 41-45 were cancelled..